

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 23, 24, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the publication by Benelli entitled "Two new coding techniques for diversity communications systems" in view of Kaewell, Jr. et al. U.S. Patent 5,402,451. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In rejecting claims 23 and 27, the Examiner has cited figure 1 of Benelli with a coder. Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that Benelli very specifically states that the coder is designed such to ensure that information on each channel differs from each other. According to Benelli "[i]n these techniques, the transmitted sequences comprising the message are made to differ from channel to channel through a special channel coding operation." (Page 1530, left column, third paragraph under Introduction). In contrast, claims 23 and 27 recite reproducing a symbol or FEC block represented by a segment of an input data stream a pre-selected number of times, which is patentably distinguishable from Benelli. Further, decoders C1 and C in Benelli are designed to take into consideration that the information received from each channel differs from each other.

As to claims 24 and 28, the Examiner has stated that "[r]egarding claims 24 and 28, Benelli discloses that the soft-combining includes weighted combining (col., 1, lines 51-53; col. 2, lines 52-56)." Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that a reference must teach each and every element of the claims. Claims 24 and 28 recite at least four different soft-combining including the weighted combining. These soft-combining are not described by Benelli.

In rejecting claims 25 and 29, the Examiner has cited the reverse channel of Lathrop. Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that in Lathrop; the reverse channel is used for retransmission only when a display unit fails to receive an information update message. In fact Lathrop specifically states that "... only those information display modules 11 that require the

retransmitted update information items need monitor the retransmission channel." (Col. 7, lines 30-33). Thus, Lathrop does not teach limitations of claims 25 and 29.

Accordingly, claims 23, 27, and those depend therefrom are patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited references. Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,



Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137